

8- *Resurrection and Mosaic Law (II): Rom 10:6-13*

Here Kirk notes '... all three strands of our argument (resurrection, hermeneutics, and theodicy) are braided together in this climactic section of the letter' (p. 162). As has been the case up to this point, I once more find myself both admiring Kirk for his work and wondering, at times, what he's thinking when he's writing. For example, he observes:

'In essence, Paul does in Romans 10 what we did in chapter 3 above: he draws together the implications of the gospel spelled out in Rom 1:16-17 and the content of the gospel is spelled out in 1:2-4' (p. 164).

What? Paul does what we did? A plain reading of this suggests that Paul has followed (!) Kirk. Of course that's not the case and everyone reading this volume knows it's not, so why doesn't Kirk write instead

'In essence we have done in chapter 3 above what Paul did in Romans 10...' This has the advantage of being more correct and less inclined to the sort of wonderment Kirk's original sentence provoked. And lest the reader of this review think me merely 'nitpicking' I should make it clear that this isn't the first time that I've gotten the impression that Kirk is teaching Paul rather than vice versa.

Then, as has become customary in this volume, Kirk redeems himself by observing 'So why cite Deuteronomy 30 in ch. 10? Because only by finding in the law a witness to God's raising Jesus from the dead can Paul also claim that the law is a witness to the gospel he has articulated in Romans...' (p. 169). Fantastic observation, Dr. Kirk.

The remainder of Kirk's exegesis in this chapter is virtually flawless, which is what makes pointing out the few weaknesses one encounters along the way so important. Does he 'braid together all three strands of his argument' as he had promised? Perhaps. Though the braid is frayed at points- yet not severed or even seriously unraveled. Chapter Nine is next.